

TREE PROPERTY AT A COUNTABLE SEGMENT OF SUCCESSOR OF SINGULAR CARDINALS

MOHAMMAD GOLSHANI AND YAIR HAYUT

ABSTRACT. Starting from the existence of many supercompact cardinals, we construct a model of *ZFC* in which the tree property holds at a countable segment of successor of singular cardinals.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let κ be a cardinal. A κ -tree T is a tree with height κ such that for every $\alpha < \kappa$, there are less than κ elements in level α . Moreover, we will assume always that the tree is normal, namely that for every element $t \in T$ with limit height the branch $\{s \in T \mid s < t\}$ determines t , and that for every $t \in T$ there are $s \in T$ above t in unbounded high levels. As usual T_α denotes the set of all elements in T with height α .

Definition 1.1. *A κ -tree T is Aronszajn if it has no branches. We say that the tree property holds at κ if there is no κ -Aronszajn tree.*

In this paper we will be interested in getting the tree property at a certain segment of successors to singular cardinals. In [1], Magidor and Shelah showed that the tree property holds (in *ZFC*) at the successor of a singular limit of strongly compact cardinals. They also showed that it is consistent relative to a large cardinal assumption, slightly above a huge cardinal, that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. This result was later improved by reducing the large cardinal assumption to ω many supercompact cardinals by Sinapova [4] using the diagonal Prikry forcing, and Neeman [2] using the product of ordinary collapse posets. In this paper we extend this result and show that it is consistent, relative to the existence of large cardinals, that the tree property holds at a countable segment of successor of singular cardinals. More precisely, we prove the following:

The first author's research has been supported by a grant from IPM (No. 91030417).

Theorem 1.2. *Assume there are κ^+ many supercompact cardinals, where κ is a supercompact cardinal. Then for each countable ordinal ϑ , there exists a model of ZFC in which the tree property holds at all cardinals of the form $\aleph_{\omega \cdot \alpha + 1}$, where $0 < \alpha < \vartheta$.*

In section 2, we will present and quote some technical lemmas that will be used during the proof of the main theorem. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. SOME PRESERVATION LEMMAS

When constructing models of the tree property, especially at successor of singular cardinals, it is sometimes easier to prove that a certain ν^+ -Aronszajn tree has a cofinal branch in some generic extension of our model. In order to show that this branch exists in the ground model we use preservation lemmas.

The next preservation lemma is due to Magidor-Shelah (see [1, Theorem 2.1]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let μ be a singular cardinal of cofinality ω , and suppose that \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} are two forcing notions such that $|\mathbb{P}| = \rho < \mu$ and \mathbb{Q} is ρ^+ -closed. Assume \dot{T} is a \mathbb{P} -name for a μ^+ -tree. Then forcing with \mathbb{Q} over $V^{\mathbb{P}}$ does not add a branch to \dot{T} .*

We will also use a variant of the following theorem, due to Neeman, [2]:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\langle \mu_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of indestructible supercompact cardinals. There is $\rho < \mu_0$ such that the forcing $\text{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \text{Col}(\rho^+, < \mu_0) \times \prod \text{Col}(\mu_n, < \mu_{n+1})$ forces the tree property at $(\sup_{n < \omega} \mu_n)^+$.*

As indicated in [2], one can replace the forcing notions of the form $\text{Col}(\mu, < \nu)$ with any μ -closed ν -Knaster forcing notion of cardinality ν . This argument is due to Neeman, and for the completeness of this paper we will show how it works in our case.

We will need to replace the Levy collapse with a forcing that has better projection properties. Let us say that a cardinal γ is *strong regular* if $\gamma^{<\gamma} = \gamma$.

Definition 2.3 (Shioya [3]). *The Easton collapse $E(\mu, \nu)$ is the product with Easton support $\prod_{\mu \leq \gamma < \nu, \gamma \text{ strong regular}} \text{Col}(\mu, \gamma)$.*

Lemma 2.4 (Shioya [3]). *Let μ be regular and ν be Mahlo cardinal. Then $E(\mu, \nu)$ is μ -closed, ν -Knaster and $|E(\mu, \nu)| = \nu$.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\langle \mu_i \mid i < \zeta \rangle$ and $\langle \nu_i \mid i < \zeta \rangle$ be increasing sequences of regular cardinals, and assume that $\zeta < \mu_0$ and $\mu_i \leq \nu_i < \mu_{i+1}$. Let $\lambda \geq \sup \mu_i$.*

There is a projection from $E(\mu_0, \lambda)$ onto the full support product $\prod_{i < \zeta} E(\mu_i, \nu_i)$.

Proof. For every $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ regular, γ strong regular, there is a continuous projection from $\text{Col}(\alpha, \gamma)$ to $\text{Col}(\beta, \gamma)$ since $\text{Col}(\beta, \gamma)$ is a α -closed forcing notion of cardinality γ . Let $\rho_\alpha^{\beta, \gamma}$ be such a projection.

For $p \in E(\mu_0, \lambda)$, set

$$\pi(p) = \langle \langle \rho_{\mu_0}^{\mu_i, \gamma}(p(\gamma)) \mid \gamma \in [\mu_i, \nu_i) \rangle \mid i < \zeta \rangle$$

Then $\pi(p) \in \prod_{i < \zeta} E(\mu_i, \nu_i)$ and $\pi : E(\mu_0, \lambda) \rightarrow \prod_{i < \zeta} E(\mu_i, \nu_i)$ is easily seen to be a projection. \square

We now turn to prove Neeman's theorem when replacing the Levy collapse by Easton collapse.

The following technical lemma shows that the conditions of [2, Lemma 3.10] are satisfied.

Lemma 2.6. *Let κ be indestructible supercompact and let $\mu < \kappa$ be regular. Let $\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1$ be forcing notions, $|\mathbb{P}_0| \leq \mu$, \mathbb{P}_0 is μ -c.c., and \mathbb{P}_1 is κ -directed closed. Then in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}_0 \times E(\mu, \kappa) \times \mathbb{P}_1$, κ is generically supercompact by a forcing $\mathbb{R} \in V$ such that \mathbb{R}^μ is μ -distributive in the generic extension.*

Proof. Let $G_0 \subseteq \mathbb{P}_0$, $G_1 \subseteq \mathbb{P}_1$ and $H \subseteq E(\mu, \kappa)$ be mutually generic filters. In $V[G_1]$, κ is supercompact by indestructibility and in $V[G_1][G_0]$ it is still supercompact by Levy-Solovay argument.

Let $\lambda \geq \kappa$ be a regular cardinal. Let $j : V[G_0][G_1] \rightarrow M$ be a λ -supercompact elementary embedding with critical point κ . In particular, $\sup j''\lambda < j(\lambda)$. $j(E(\mu, \kappa)) \cong E(\mu, \kappa) \times \mathbb{R}$ where \mathbb{R} is the Easton support product of $\text{Col}(\mu, \gamma)$ over every $\gamma \in [\kappa, j(\kappa))$ strong regular in M . \mathbb{R} is μ -closed in V and $\mathbb{R}^\mu \cong \mathbb{R}$. Since $j(p) = p$ for every $p \in E(\mu, \kappa)$, in order to extend the elementary embedding j we need to pick any $M[H]$ -generic filter for \mathbb{R} .

\mathbb{R} is μ -closed in $V[G_1][H]$ and therefore it is μ -distributive in $V[G_0][G_1][H]$. Since $\mathbb{R}^\mu \cong \mathbb{R}$ the same holds for \mathbb{R}^μ . \square

Let $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an ω -sequence of indestructible supercompact cardinals. Let $\mathbb{C} = \prod_{n < \omega} E(\kappa_n^{++}, \kappa_{n+1})$. For every $n < \omega$, $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C} \restriction n \times E(\kappa_n, \kappa_{n+1}) \times \mathbb{C} \restriction [n+1, \omega)$. By Lemma 2.6, in the generic extension by \mathbb{C} for every $n > 0$ and for every $\lambda \geq \kappa_n$, there is a forcing notion \mathbb{R} that adds an elementary embedding with critical point κ_n , discontinuity at λ and $\mathbb{R}^{\kappa_{n-1}}$ is κ_{n-1} -distributive. By the indestructibility of κ_0 , it is still supercompact in the generic extension by \mathbb{C} .

We are now ready to apply the general result, [2, Lemma 3.10] and conclude:

Theorem 2.7. *Let $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an ω -sequence of indestructible supercompact cardinals. There is $\rho < \kappa_0$ such that the forcing:*

$$\text{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \text{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) \times \prod_{n < \omega} E(\kappa_n^{++}, \kappa_{n+1})$$

forces the tree property at the successor of $\sup \kappa_n$.

3. GETTING TREE PROPERTY AT MANY SUCCESSOR OF SINGULAR CARDINALS

In this section we prove our main theorem 1.2.

Let S be a set of indestructible supercompact cardinals and assume that $\text{otp } S = (\min S)^+$.

Let $\delta = \sup S$ and let $\kappa_0 = \min S$.

Let $D = \text{acc } S \cap S_\omega^\delta$ and let us pick for every $\alpha \in D$ an ω -sequence $s_\alpha \subseteq S$ such that $\sup s_\alpha = \alpha$.

For every $\alpha \in D$, by Theorem 2.7, there is $\rho_\alpha < \kappa_0$ such that the forcing

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha = \text{Col}(\omega, \rho_\alpha) \times \text{Col}(\rho_\alpha^+, < \kappa_0) \times \prod E(s_\alpha(n)^{++}, s_\alpha(n+1))$$

forces the tree property at α^+ . Therefore, there is $\rho < \kappa_0$ and $S' \subseteq D$ stationary, such that for every $\alpha \in S'$, $\rho_\alpha = \rho$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\vartheta < \omega_1$. Then there exists a closed $t \subseteq S$ of order type ϑ such that*

$$\alpha \in \text{acc}(t) \implies \alpha \in S' \text{ and } s_\alpha \subseteq t.$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on ϑ . Let us observe that if t satisfies the conditions of the lemma, then so does any $t' \subseteq t$ such that $t \subseteq t' \subseteq S$, and $|t' \setminus t| < \aleph_0$. Therefore, the interesting cases are when ϑ is a limit ordinal.

If $\vartheta = \varphi + \omega$, then by the induction hypothesis there is t' of order type φ , satisfying the conditions of the lemma. Let $\alpha > \sup t'$ in S' . Take $t = t' \cup \{\sup t\} \cup s_\alpha$.

If ϑ is a limit of limit ordinals, let us pick $\alpha \in S'$ such that for every $\zeta < \vartheta$ and every $\beta < \alpha$ there is $t \subseteq \alpha \setminus \beta$ of order type $\zeta + 1$ satisfying the conditions of the lemma. Since S' is stationary - this is possible. Let $\langle \beta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be the increasing enumeration of s_α . Let $\langle \zeta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be a sequence of countable ordinals such that $\sup \zeta_n = \vartheta$.

By induction on $n < \omega$, let t_n be a witness for the conditions of the lemma such that $\text{otp } t_n \geq \zeta_n$, $\min t_n > \max t_{n-1}$, $s_\alpha(n)$ and $t_n \subseteq \alpha$. The sequence $t = s_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{n < \omega} t_n$ has ordertype $\geq \vartheta$ and satisfies the conditions of the lemma, since $\text{acc } t = \{\alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{n < \omega} \text{acc } t_n$. \square

We are now ready to prove the main theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let S' , $\langle s_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D \rangle$ and t be as above.

Let \mathbb{P}_t be the forcing notion

$$\mathbb{P}_t = \text{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \text{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) \times \prod_{i < \vartheta} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1))$$

and let G_t be \mathbb{P}_t -generic over V . We show that in $V[G_t]$, the tree property holds at all cardinals of the form $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, where $\alpha < \vartheta$ is a limit ordinal. The next claim is clear.

Claim 3.2. *For each limit ordinal $\alpha < \vartheta$, $\aleph_\alpha^{V[G_t]} = t(\alpha)$ and $\aleph_{\alpha+1}^{V[G_t]} = t(\alpha)^+$.*

Assume $\alpha < \vartheta$ is a limit ordinal, so, by the construction of t , we have $s_{t(\alpha)} \subseteq t$. Also let $\langle \xi_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals less than ϑ such that $t(\xi_n) = s_{t(\alpha)}(n)$ (thus $\xi_0 = 0$). Also set $\xi = \sup_{n < \omega} \xi_n \leq \vartheta$. Note that

$$t(\xi) = \sup_{n < \omega} t(\xi_n) = \sup_{n < \omega} s_{t(\alpha)}(n) = t(\alpha),$$

so in fact $\xi = \alpha$. Then we can write \mathbb{P}_t as $\mathbb{P}_t = \mathbb{P}_{t,1} \times \mathbb{P}_{t,2}$ where

$$\mathbb{P}_{t,1} = \text{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \text{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) \times \prod_{i < \alpha} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1))$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{t,2} = \prod_{\alpha \leq i < \vartheta} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1)).$$

Also let $G_t = G_{t,1} \times G_{t,2}$ correspond to $\mathbb{P}_t = \mathbb{P}_{t,1} \times \mathbb{P}_{t,2}$. We have

$$\prod_{i < \alpha} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1)) = \prod_{n < \omega} \prod_{\xi_n \leq i < \xi_{n+1}} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1)).$$

But, by Lemma 2.5, for any $n < \omega$, there is a natural projection

$$\pi_n : E(s_{t(\alpha)}(n)^{++}, s_{t(\alpha)}(n+1)) \rightarrow \prod_{\xi_n \leq i < \xi_{n+1}} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1)),$$

and so we have a projection

$$\prod_{n < \omega} \pi_n : \prod_{n < \omega} E(s_{t(\alpha)}(n)^{++}, s_{t(\alpha)}(n+1)) \rightarrow \prod_{n < \omega} \prod_{\xi_n \leq i < \xi_{n+1}} E(t(i)^{++}, t(i+1)).$$

This induces a projection (in V)

$$\pi : \mathbb{P}_{t(\alpha)} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{t,1}.$$

Let us split $\mathbb{P}_{t(\alpha)}$ to a product $\text{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \mathbb{Q}_{t(\alpha)}$ where $\mathbb{Q}_{t(\alpha)}$ is ρ^+ -closed. Similarly, split $\mathbb{P}_{t,1} = \text{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \mathbb{Q}_{t,1}$. Let $H_{t,1}$ be the generic filter $G_{t,1}$ restricted to $\mathbb{Q}_{t,1}$.

The quotient forcing $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{P}_{t(\alpha)}/G_{t,1}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}_{t(\alpha)}/H_{t,1}$. By the continuity of the projection and the closure of the forcing notions, in $V[H_{t,1}]$, \mathbb{R} is ρ^+ -closed.

Let $H_{t,2}$ be a generic filter for $\mathbb{P}_{t,2}$. Let G_α be $\mathbb{P}_{t(\alpha)}$ -generic over V with $\pi[G_\alpha] = G_{t,1}$. Let $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and let $C \subseteq \text{Col}(\omega, \rho)$ be generic filters such that $V[G_t] = V[C][H_{t,1}][H_{t,2}]$ and $V[G_\alpha] = V[H_{t,1}][C][R]$.

Now suppose that T is a $t(\alpha)^+$ -tree in $V[G_t]$. The forcing $\mathbb{P}_{t,2}$ is $t(\alpha)^{++}$ -closed in V and thus $t(\alpha)^{++}$ -distributive in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}_{t,1}$. So $T \in V[G_{t,1}]$. The tree property holds at $t(\alpha)^+$ in $V[G_\alpha]$, so T has a cofinal branch in $V[G_\alpha]$, and by applying 2.1 in $V[H_{t,1}]$, \mathbb{R} cannot add a branch to T . So we conclude that T already has a branch in $V[G_{t,1}] \subseteq V[G_t]$. So T is not a $t(\alpha)^+$ -Aronszajn tree in $V[G_t]$, as required. \square

We close the paper with the following question.

Question 3.3. *Is it consistent with ZFC that the tree property holds at successor of every singular cardinal?*

REFERENCES

- [1] Magidor, Menachem; Shelah, Saharon, The tree property at successors of singular cardinals. Arch. Math. Logic 35 (1996), no. 5–6, 385–404.
- [2] Neeman, Itay, The tree property up to $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. J. Symb. Log. 79 (2014), no. 2, 429–459.
- [3] Shioya, Masahiro, *The Easton collapse and a saturated filter*, RIMS Kôkyûroku **1754** (2011), 108–114.
- [4] Sinapova, Dima, The tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. J. Symbolic Logic 77 (2012), no. 1, 279–290.

School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box: 19395-5746, Tehran-Iran.

E-mail address: golshani.m@gmail.com

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, Jerusalem 91904, Israel.

E-mail address: yair.hayut@mail.huji.ac.il